

Remarks

This REPLY is in response to the Office Action mailed March 5, 2008. No additional fee is due with this communication.

I. Summary of Examiner's Rejections

In the Office Action mailed March 05, 2008, Claims 4, 11, and 18 were provisionally rejected for non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting. The Specification was objected to for various informalities. Claims 1-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first and second paragraphs as failing to comply with the enablement requirement and as being indefinite. Claims 1-21 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Mercury Interactive, "LoadRunner—Creating Vuser Scripts Windows and Unix version 7.51" (hereafter the LoadRunner reference).

II. Summary of Applicant's Amendment

The present Reply amends Claims 1, 8, and 15, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration Claims 1-21. Reconsideration of the Application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

III. Double Patenting

Claims 4, 11, and 18 were provisionally rejected under the doctrine of non-statutory obviousness type double patenting over the claims of copending Applications 10/814,546. An appropriate Terminal Disclaimer is included herewith. Applicant respectfully submits that the Terminal Disclaimer renders moot the rejection of the claims under the doctrine of non-statutory obviousness type double patenting, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

IV. Specification

The Specification was objected to for various informalities. Accordingly, the Specification has been amended as shown above. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

V. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 101

In the Office Action mailed March 05, 2008, Claims 1-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Accordingly, Claim 1 has been amended as shown above. Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1, as amended, and Claims 2-7, which depend from Claim 1, now conform to the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

VI. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112

In the Office Action mailed March 05, 2008, Claims 1-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first and second paragraphs as failing to comply with the enablement requirement and as being indefinite. Accordingly, Claims 1, 8 and 15 have been amended as shown above. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1, 8, and 15, as amended, and Claims 2-7, 9-14, and 16-21 which depend from Claims 1, 8, and 15, respectively, now comply with 35 U.S.C. 112, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

VII. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102

In the Office Action mailed February 21, 2008, Claims 1-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Mercury Interactive, "LoadRunner—Creating Vuser Scripts Windows and Unix version 7.51" (hereafter the LoadRunner reference).

Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define the embodiment therein. As amended, Claim 1 defines:

1. *(Currently Amended) A system that provides a generic user interface testing framework, comprising:
a computer including a computer readable medium, and a processor operating thereon;
an interpretive engine, executing on the computer, that receives and translates generic interface commands, which are abstractions independent of any tool-specific scripting language, from a tester;*

a function library for mapping the generic interface commands to native language understood by a particular test software tool; and,
wherein the interpretive engine uses the function library to map the generic interface commands into test software tool-dependent codes that are then passed to the test software tool.

Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define the embodiment therein as a system that provides a generic user interface testing framework. The embodiment comprises a computer including a computer readable medium, and a processor operating thereon. The embodiment further comprises an interpretive engine, executing on the computer, that receives and translates generic interface commands from a tester. The embodiment also comprises a function library for mapping the generic interface commands to native language understood by a particular test software tool. The interpretive engine uses the function library to map the generic interface commands into test software tool-dependent codes that are then passed to the test software tool.

The advantages of the embodiment defined by Claim 1 include that the system maps generic interface commands into tool-specific testing operations. While automated test development systems, suites and tools have been developed, the typical approach of such automated test development tools requires that the operator have knowledge not just of the test-tool-specific scripting language and environment, but also the specific features and idioms of the vendor-specific tool environment. The learning curve for these testing tools can be significant, and is often of use solely with that one tool. In accordance with the embodiment of Claim 1, the system can, for example, be used to insulate testers from the tool-specific testing operations of a particular testing tool, so that effort spent testing the build of a software application can be reduced.

LoadRunner is Mercury Interactive's tool for testing the performance of applications. (Page xix). LoadRunner emulates an environment in which thousands of users work with a client/server system concurrently. To do this, LoadRunner replaces the human user with a virtual user (Vuser). The actions that a Vuser performs are described in a Vuser script. (Page 3). LoadRunner provides a variety of Vuser technologies that enable you to generate server load when using different types of client/server architectures. Each Vuser technology is suited to a particular architecture and results in a specific type of Vuser. For example, you use Web Vusers to emulate users operating web browsers; Tuxedo Vusers to emulate Tuxedo clients

communicating with a Tuxedo application server; RTE Vusers to operate terminal emulators. (Pages 5-6).

Additionally, the LoadRunner reference discloses that the Vuser Script Generator, also known as VuGen, is LoadRunner's primary tool for developing Vuser scripts. (Page 13). When you record a Vuser script, VuGen generates various functions that define the actions that you perform during the recording session. VuGen inserts these functions into the VuGen editor to create a basic Vuser script. The inserted functions include general Vuser functions and protocol-specific Vuser functions: The general Vuser functions are also known as LR functions. They can be used in any type of Vuser script. There are separate LoadRunner functions for C and Java. The protocol-specific Vuser functions are specific to the Vuser type. For example, Vugen uses LRT functions in a Tuxedo script, and LRS functions in a Windows Socket Script. The general Vuser functions and the protocol-specific functions together form the LoadRunner API and enable Vusers to communicate directly with a server. (Page 13).

In the Office Action, the Examiner noted that an "interface interpreting user creation of a VUscript using Vuser by listing and providing objects/functions names from native libraries like COM or JDK reads on mapping generic interface commands to libraries-based specific functions for tool-dependent codes." Chapter 11 of the LoadRunner reference was cited for support. Chapter 11 discloses recording Java language Vuser scripts. VuGen creates a pure Java script enhanced with LoadRunner-specific Java functions. Sun's standard Java compiler, javac.exe, checks the script for errors and compiles it. Once [the user] verifi[ies] that the script is functional, [the user] incorporate[s] it into a LoadRunner scenario. (Page 155).

Applicant respectfully submits that the LoadRunner reference appears to disclose a software testing tool that allows a developer to create scripts to test applications. Each script includes general functions which are Vuser-specific functions and protocol-specific functions specific to the type of application being tested. LoadRunner, as a test software tool, can create scripts, using its script generator VuGen, that are compatible with a wide range of applications and environments. This allows a user to test many of his applications under many simulated conditions so that the applications can be debugged and further developed. Additionally, the LoadRunner reference appears to disclose creating a script, having protocol-specific functions written in Java, to test a Java application. As described above, the script also includes Vuser-specific functions.

By contrast, Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define generic interface commands, which are abstractions *independent of any tool-specific scripting language*. The

LoadRunner reference appears to disclose tool-specific functions (Vuser-specific) and application-specific functions (protocol-specific), however, Applicant respectfully submits that the LoadRunner reference does not disclose or render obvious generic interface commands, which are abstractions independent of any tool-specific scripting language. For example, if a user creates a test script using LoadRunner but then chooses to use a competitor's test tool, it does not appear that the user can use the same test script, without modification. Thus, the commands appear to remain tool-specific. However, in the embodiment of Claim 1, a test case input file contains *generic interface commands that are abstractions independent of any tool-specific scripting language*. The test case input file can be reused as necessary by the user for testing against a software application's user interface in different software test tools. Applicant respectfully submits that the LoadRunner reference does not disclose or render obvious these features.

Additionally, Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define that the interpretive engine uses the function library to map the *generic interface commands* into test software tool-dependent codes that are then passed to the test software tool. As noted above, the LoadRunner reference appears only to generate tool-specific scripts for Vuser and application-specific scripts for the application being tested. Applicant respectfully submits that the LoadRunner reference does not appear to disclose or render obvious these features.

In view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1, as currently amended, is neither anticipated by nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-7, 9-14, and 16-21

Claims 2-7, 9-14, and 16-21 have not been addressed separately but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim, and further in view of the comments provided above. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 2-7, 9-14, and 16-21, are similarly neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 8 and 15

The comments provided above with respect to Claim 1 are hereby incorporated by reference. Claims 8 and 15 have been similarly amended to more clearly define the embodiments therein. For similar reasons as provided above with respect to Claim 1, Applicant

respectfully submits that Claims 8 and 15, as amended, are likewise neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

VIII. Conclusion

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 5, 2008

By: /Nathan L. Feld/
Nathan L. Feld
Reg. No. 59,725

FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800
Customer No. 23910